

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3 and 6-8 are pending. By this Response, claims 1 and 6 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

#### **35 U.S.C § 112, First Paragraph**

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, it is alleged that the recitation of “wherein said first Bluetooth module automatically checks for a signal that the first Bluetooth module is connected to the holder,” as amended in the previous Response, is not disclosed in the specification. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 6 to include features which clarify the intended meaning of the amended features in the previous Response. Applicant notes that support for these features is at least found on pages 11-12 of the specification.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 6 are proper claims and comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **Prior art rejections**

Claims 1 and 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kushita (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,689), Haruki (JP 2002-290606) and Lilja (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,640) and claim 6

stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kushita and Haruki. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Although the preamble of the rejections include cancelled claims 4 and 5 and do not refer to claims 7 and 8, it appears that claims 4 and 5 are not addressed in the body of the rejection and claim 7 is addressed with regard to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection in view of the combination of Kushita, Haruki and Lilja and claim 8 is addressed in regards to the rejection in view of the combination of Kushita and Haruki. Thus, Applicant considers the cancellation of claims 4 and 5 as recognized and the rejection of claims 7 and 8 as included in the respective combination of rejections noted above.

Claims 1 and 6 recite, *inter alia*, a first terminal provided with a first Bluetooth module for performing short-distance wireless communications by using Bluetooth and a first control unit for starting said first Bluetooth module where said first terminal provided with said first Bluetooth module automatically checks for a signal that the first terminal provided with said first Bluetooth module is connected to a holder...wherein said second terminal includes said holder having a detector for detecting whether or not said first terminal is set to said holder, and for outputting a set signal when detecting that said first terminal is set to said holder.

Thus, the first terminal detects that it is connected to the holder allowing it to initiate internal operations and also the holder of the second terminal detects that the first terminal is connected to the holder. Applicant respectfully submits that Kushita, Haruki and Lilja fail to teach these features.

Kushita is relied upon to teach identification of a device to a cradle. The Examiner relies upon column 4, lines 18-37 of Kushita to teach the claimed holder of the second terminal detecting the first terminal connected to the holder. However, there is no teaching in Kushita of both the first terminal detecting that it is connected to the holder and also that the holder of the second terminal detecting that the first terminal is connected to the holder.

Further, Kushita fails to teach that communication between a first and second terminal is performed automatically. Kushita teaches that a portable phone initiates communication with it within the automobile system only after first initiating a button key 107 to begin the communication. See column 3, lines 5-10 and column 5, lines 45-53. Thus, user intervention is required and communication is not performed automatically. As taught in Kushita, initiation of a button key to begin the communication must be done even if the portable phone is attached to a cradle.

Thus, Kushita further fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, automatically establishing a wireless communication between said first terminal and said second terminal, as recited in claims 1 and 6.

Furthermore, Haruki and Lilja fail to remedy the deficiencies of Kushita. Haruki is provided to teach the use of Bluetooth communication and Lilja is provided to teach the use of a charging device. Therefore, the combination of Kushita with Haruki and Lilja fail to teach each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 6 as required. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**


For at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3 and 6-8 are distinguished over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings, Registration No. 48,917, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Chad J. Billings  
Registration No.: 48,917  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicants